Ham-Policy Digest   Tue, 18 May 93   Volume 93 : Issue 151

Today's Topics:
             11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity) (2 msgs)
                      ARRL internet address???
                         Morse et cetera...
                     No-Code Stupidity (4 msgs)
                     No Code Debate (2 msgs)
                        Type certification

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 17:27:14 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!
r_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78Evt.M7z@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:
>r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:
>
>[Todd's stuff deleted]
>:   Well, I'm sure you're a seasoned pro at this, and you've "seen it
>: all", but if you are trying to tell me that the INTENTIONAL name
>: calling, overpowering, and overall rudeness on the HF bands are equal
>Just out of curiosity what is non-intentional anme calling?
>
>: to 11 meters, you've got to be kidding me. I was a CBer for a while

```
>: before I got my ticket, so I can say that I've seen both ends of the
>: spectrum.  In 11 meters, I've witnessed people keying up intentionaly
>: to prevent others from using that channel.  I heard challenges to
>
>It's nice to see that YOU have seen it all!

  I never said that i've "seen it all" I said that I've seen both ends
of the spectrum.  There's a bit of a difference.

>: fights.  I've seen "fox hunts" where CBers try to locate somebodys signal,
>: and stick pins in their coax.  Never once have I seen that such actions
>: the HF bands.  Sure there's the occiasional pileup, and people can be

>You've NEVER seen such activity on HF?  Well I guess you haven't sen it all.

  Please cite to me when you have seen one amateur locate another's
signal just for the sheer enjoymant of shorting their coax.  I've
NEVER seen it.

>: jerks, but nothing like 11 meters.  I'm sorry, but I don't buy it.
>:
>: >>Let's face it, there's a little bit of a difference between talking to
>: >>your buddy accross the street, and working a rare staition in some
>: >>obscure part of the world.  Please reconsider your argument.
>: >
>: >For me there is a difference because I like to chase DX.  To a non-DXer
>: >they're the same. Certainly neither one is more important than the
>: >other.  Each one to their own.
>:
>:    Well Todd, once again, you missed the point.  What you're saying is
>: that to a non-DXer, the distance factor is the same.  Then for a non
>: DXer, it's O.K. to use 1k watts to talk to his friend across the
>: street.  I'm SURE the FCC would approve of that.
>
>When was the last time an NAL was handed out for using more than the
>minimum power required, but within the maximum legal levels?  I am just
>wondering, this is not a flame or argumentative point just curiosity.
>
   Well Dan, it is my personal belif that the ARRL is an orginazation
who's purpose is is based primarily on money.  Therefore, I am not a
member, and I am not suscribed to QST, and I do not have the
information you request. I don't know when the last NAL was given
for the purpose that you stated, but I can only assume that
such reprimands are not given all too often because of the
subjectivity of that particular law.

Have a great day!!!
Ron
```

N1HIB

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 19:56:54 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78F5r.MEu@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:
>What difference does it make anyway. If an amateur is radiating excess
>spurious signals, for example, isn't s/he just as guilty.

Ever make a mistake, Dan?

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 21:01:04 GMT
From: ulowell!woods.ulowell.edu!murphyed1@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL internet address???
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Does the ARRL have an internet address??? Is it FTP able?>???

If so, does anyone have the numbers for it??? eg 128.222.344.12

Thanks...

Ed...

--
===== Ed Murphy   (The University disclaims everything!)   --- | / ----
   | Internet Mail :: Murphyed1@woods.ulowell.edu   /|\ |/   \
===== "Warning, Phi Kap's May Be Habit Forming!!!"   \|/ |\   /
   | Groundmail (The Slow Way) 1 University Ave. Box 1136 --- | \ ----
===   Lowell, Ma. 01854 U.S.A.   Phi Kappa Sigma
                                                           Gamma Upsilon Chapter
Ham Radio -- N1OQF

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 05:50:46 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!

In article <Z4go4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
writes:
>ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:
>
>> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>> :
>> : Is it that the Codeless Technician is not satisfactory to these
>> : individuals? It seems to me that the current privileges conferred by this
>> [Same arguement duplicated three times with slight variation deleted]
>>
>> I'll type it real slowly for you this time, maybe you'll understand ;-)
>> It is not that all these people want to give more privleges to the
>> technician class license!!! The discussion is if we should try to change
>> the licensing requirements for higher license classes!! Most of the
>> people aren't arguing about the current technician class structure. The
>> discussion relates to other classes (ie. General, Advanced and Extra).
>>
>I would be very interested in knowing what class of amateur license YOU
>have, Dan. Rather than constantly complain about how unfair the current
>licensing structure is, wouldn't it be easier (and more productive) for
>you to simply upgrade through the amateur ranks? Wait...that's unfair
>too, isn't it. It requires EFFORT.
>
> --Robert

Oh, gawd, the self-righteous Extra class crap. It was destined to
come out. I love it, every time someone questions the "establishment",
someone immediately discards the questions with "Oh, you probably want
something for free". Gack.

Robert, I *am* an Extra, and I think the 13 and 20 WPM tests are no
longer relevant to licensing. How are you going to refute me?

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
 * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 18:05:54 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
oz.plymouth.edu!d_umstea@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May16.214331.20770@anomaly.sbs.com> wr1r@anomaly.sbs.com (Frank
Almeida (WR1R)) writes:
>I'm pretty new to this whole bunch of discussion about code versus no-code.
>You people should get a life, learning code has been around for a long
>time and if I had to learn it to 20 words per minute then you're going
>to have to learn it to 20 words too.
>
>I also support beefing up the theory to keep the CB transplants out
>of the bands (you know, the ones with their callsigns on their belt buckles and
the ones who ground their equipment to a gas pipe).
>
>Flame away -- I love hatemail.
>
>73 de WR1R
>Frank
>
>wr1r@anomaly.sbs.risc.net
>:

   Hey, I'm no CBer, but I enjoy reeking a little havoc on the bands
every now and then. I like to scan the bands until I find a really
juicy conversation, then I crank my lienar, and walk all over their
asses. I don't have any licence, but it's allways a good time to
pretend that theres been an emergencey, and get everyone worked up over
a little joke. You damn amateurs are so stuck up, allways concerned
about silly little rules and regulations. Well, I dont know any code,
and I can still have a great time working you guys up. Sometimes, I
have "ham bashing" parties. Me and my friends all get on out radios,
and try to ruin as many of your QSOs as possible. My record is 24 in
one hour. That was pretty tough. I had to get on and call on guy a
fuckin dick-licker before the other guy he was talking to just gave
up. So if you ever have the problem of someone keying up over you,
it's probably me! The best time to fuckin be rude is during those
contests. YOu need to find domeone who's doing well, and just follow
him around the bands, and key up whenever he trys to call CQ. No more
contacts for him. Well, you loose some, you loose some. Have a
fuckin raunchy day!

Dave

Flame me, I need the laugh!

```
------------------------------

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 20:08:51 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May18.180554.13413@oz.plymouth.edu> d_umstea@oz.plymouth.edu
(David C. Umstead) writes:
>   Hey, I'm no CBer, but I enjoy reeking a little havoc on the bands
>every now and then.  I like to scan the bands until I find a really
>juicy conversation, then I crank my lienar, and walk all over their
>asses.

Flame bait.  Rather lame Minnows Flambe as they go.  You forgot the bit
about the Power Mic, the hick accent, and playing Nirvana's _Smells Like
Teen Spirit_ on 20 at 2am.  Disappointing.

>Flame me, I need the laugh!

Try 75m phone after midnight.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU   |  -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_


------------------------------

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 12:50:18 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

> In article <1993May18.105200.10880@anomaly.sbs.com>, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (R
> |>
> |> >As you said, get a life (before you fall off your pedestal or pass out du
> |> >to lack of oxygen.)
> |>
> |> Yep, folks, the mandatory laughable-personal-attack. You can definitely te
> |> you're winning the argument when these puerile attacks become a regular pa
> |> of the posting... Of course, from this poster, should we expect any less?
> |>
> |> MD
```

```
> |> --
> |> --  Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ                    /    Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
> --
>
> You can win a debate and you can sway a discussion but you can't "win" an
> argument because the very word implies strong emotions.  (ME)
>
> You don't really believe that you're somehow going to convince the no-coders
> to see it your way, do you?  About as likely as you offering a no-code
> technician seminar!
>
Tom, is there some reason why no-code technicians cannot simply be HAPPY
with the class of license they earned, rather than constantly bitching
about how unfair the system is? Personally, I'm really sick of listening
to them whine about this topic. If one wishes to upgrade, there's a
system in place for them to do that. If they don't want to upgrade,
that's fine, too. Thousands have already upgraded, and thousands will in
the future. But it takes effort and determination to advance in the
amateur ranks, and if they are unwilling to put forth that effort, they
will not upgrade. It's that simple. In real life, hard work and
dedication is rewarded by a pay raise, advancement, and greater
responsibility. The same is true in amateur radio. Something to think
about.

  --Robert

-----------------------------

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 20:47:10 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
: tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:
:
: >
: > You can win a debate and you can sway a discussion but you can't "win" an
: > argument because the very word implies strong emotions.  (ME)
: >
: > You don't really believe that you're somehow going to convince the no-coders
: > to see it your way, do you?  About as likely as you offering a no-code
: > technician seminar!
: >
: Tom, is there some reason why no-code technicians cannot simply be HAPPY
: with the class of license they earned, rather than constantly bitching
: about how unfair the system is? Personally, I'm really sick of listening
```

: to them whine about this topic. If one wishes to upgrade, there's a
: system in place for them to do that. If they don't want to upgrade,
: that's fine, too. Thousands have already upgraded, and thousands will in
: the future. But it takes effort and determination to advance in the
: amateur ranks, and if they are unwilling to put forth that effort, they
: will not upgrade. It's that simple. In real life, hard work and
: dedication is rewarded by a pay raise, advancement, and greater
: responsibility. The same is true in amateur radio. Something to think
: about.

I guess there really are people left on the net who claim to be reading
this thread who STILL don't know what the thread is about! sigh.

Dan
--
---
* Daniel D. Todd   Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa   *
*   Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu   *
*   Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102   *
*   Davis CA 95616   *
---
*   I do not speak for the University of California....   *
*   and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!   *

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 20:06:01 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!sysad.cnde.iastate.edu!
njohnson@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Code Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'm currently a Technician Class operator (a no coder).

I plan to learn code (I have most of the alphabet down now)
and upgrade to at least General before the year ends.

I will personally feel a great sense of accomplsihment for achieving
something that required effort and self-discipline.

It will be a feeling that nobody can take away from me.

I had the same feeling when I finished my first computer program.
I had the same feeling when I got my B.S. in Computer Engineering.
I had the same feeling when I got my yellow, then orange belt in Tae Kwon Do.

I had the same feeling when I was recognized for being an outstanding first year
Jaycee.
I had the same feeling when I passed my no-code exam.

I believe that's what this debate finally comes down to; Whether or not code is a
technical requirement or part of the personal challenge of becoming a HAM.

I feel it is a personal challenge.

Even if the code-requirement is no-longer required for HF priveleges, I will still
take pride in having put the effort into learning Morse code.

--
Neil Johnson, N0SFH (soon /AG) | Systems Administrator
njohnson@cnde.iastate.edu | Center for Nondestructive Evaluation
njohnson@sysad.cnde.iastate.edu | Institute for Physical Research & Technology
neil@iastate.edu | Iowa State University
                                  | Ames, Iowa

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 20:56:59 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
oz.plymouth.edu!r_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Code Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C78nu2.HGv@news.iastate.edu> njohnson@sysad.cnde.iastate.edu (Neil
Johnson) writes:
>I'm currently a Technician Class operator (a no coder).
>
>I plan to learn code (I have most of the alphabet down now)
>and upgrade to at least General before the year ends.
>
>I will personally feel a great sense of accomplsihment for achieving
>something that required effort and self-discipline.
>
>It will be a feeling that nobody can take away from me.
>
>I had the same feeling when I finished my first computer program.
>I had the same feeling when I got my B.S. in Computer Engineering.
>I had the same feeling when I got my yellow, then orange belt in Tae Kwon Do.
>I had the same feeling when I was recognized for being an outstanding first year
>Jaycee.
>I had the same feeling when I passed my no-code exam.
>
>I believe that's what this debate finally comes down to; Whether or not code is a
>technical requirement or part of the personal challenge of becoming a HAM.

```
>
>I feel it is a personal challenge.
>
>Even if the code-requirement is no-longer required for HF priveleges, I will
still
>take pride in having put the effort into learning Morse code.
>

    NOw this guy has a good attitude about the whole thing.  Too bad
the other no-code techs don't take after this genteleman's example

------------------------------

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 20:42:49 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Type certification
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@calvin.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: In article <C76unK.CE@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:
: >Hello all,
: >
: >I'm interested in the requirements for type certification.
:
: The generic answer is to obtain a copy of the Code Of Federal Rules, Chapter
: 47 (aka 47 CFR).  You'll find a copy at the Government Documents Library
: at UC Davis.  There are a number of "levels" of inspection, from checking
: model calculations (the least stringent) to testing every device off the
: assembly line (the most stringent).
:
I was looking for a little guidance in what type of experience those on
the net have had.It is interesting that I don't recall you respondong to
others with non-answers to their questions.  I was hoping to start a
discussion related to type certification and learn about the actual
applications and enforcements that are being pursued today.  I find that
when I engage in discussion with people more knowledgeable than my self
on a topic that I learn and understand the subject better than just
reading a list of rules.  To wit, the recent discussion about the legality
of non-cw digital modes on the novice 10m band.  There were a number of
people who all read the rules and had different opinions about the
interpretation of the rules.


Dan
--
*----------------------------------------------------------------------*
```

```
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa              *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu                      *
*                   Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102                      *
*                               Davis CA 95616                         *
*----------------------------------------------------------------------*
*        I do not speak for the University of California....           *
*        and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!                    *
*----------------------------------------------------------------------*
```

Date: 17 May 93 14:14:13 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!hp-cv!ogicse!
usenet.ee.pdx.edu!fastrac.llnl.gov!wsrcc.com!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!
psinntp!laidbak!tellab5!balr!ttd.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6xALy.1MJ@ucdavis.edu>, <93133.135221WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>,
<1993May14.134347.26989@ke4zv.uucp>wetw
Subject : Re: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

In article <1993May14.134347.26989@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman)
writes:
> Certainly you can pass now if you miss all the ATV questions, and ATV
> is just as valid an operating mode as Morse. It's becoming nearly as
                                              ----
> popular too.

>

Uhh - I wouldn't go that far.

ATV may be getting more popular, but 'nearly as popular' as CW? Naaaahhhhh.
There's not enough bandwidth in the 'world' to support a tiny fraction of
the ATV signals as compared to the CW signals on 20meters on any given day.

```
   John Rice -  K9IJ          | "Did I say that ?" I must have, but It was
   rice@ttd.teradyne.com      |   MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially
   (708)-940-9000 - (work)    |   Not my Employer's.... Licensed since 1959
   (708)-438-5065 - (bbs )    |   Ex: K8YZR, KH6GHC, WB9CSP, W9MMB, WA1TXV
```

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 20:16:43 GMT

From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!sysad.cnde.iastate.edu!
njohnson@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993May17.230005.27469@oz.plymouth.edu>, <1993May18.142252.13012@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: No-Code Stupidity

Saw your .sig file, thought it was funny. (You'll understand when you read
my .sig!)
-neil

--
Neil Johnson, N0SFH | Systems Administrator
njohnson@cnde.iastate.edu | Center for Nondestructive Evaluation
njohnson@sysad.cnde.iastate.edu | Institute for Physical Research & Technology
neil@iastate.edu | Iowa State University
                                 | Ames, Iowa

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 05:40:29 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!
csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
atlas.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6Gu9B.K9L@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>,
<1993May3.231537.11520@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<930515.190923.6g4.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>d.la.l
Subject : Re: RE: sick of it all

In article <930515.190923.6g4.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com> system@mooch.sbs.com
writes:
>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>
>> Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can
>> copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit
>> bizarre.
>
>Maybe it's bizarre to someone who whines about how difficult the code
>is.

I have never whined about the code being difficult.

> The extra portion of the bands should be reserved for amateurs with

>reasonable techinical and morse code prowess.

Why do you believe this? How do your beliefs achieve the goals explained
in 47 CFR Part 97.1? Please be specific and substantive.

> If all the opponents of
>code put the effort they extole about fighting the code requirment into
>learing the code they'd be all set. Just get it done! Stop whining!
>Extra class amateur radio operators are supposed to "excel" in the radio
>art. Stop trying to water the hobby down. The lowest common
>denominator seems to be your goal.

I *am* an Extra. I do not dislike code. I do not believe the CW requirements
today are valid in achieving the goals of the Amateur Radio Service as
outlined in 47 CFR Part 97.1.

>> In addition I think most have "wanted" the written exams
>> I haven't heard anyone advocate "giving" licenses away. Did you read that
>> somewhere? Let's evolve and encourage amateurs to learn something they can
>> use to improve the state of the art, not preserve the past. Amateur radio
>> is not a historical preservation society the last time I checked. This
>> isn't about making it "easier" it's about making it relevant.
>
>Well spoken Todd. But I do believe Morse Code is still relevant. I
>guess that is the only area where our views diverge. But in a
>fundamental sense I would have to agree with you.

Given you agree with an important issue which leads me to question the
utility of CW in the examination, what causes you to decide CW is still
relevant to licensing?

P.S. I'm surprised the SBS gave you an account, too. You sound rather
reasonable.

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
 * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
    *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #151
****